Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 16 1997
CLERK

No. 96-1427

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1996

JOSEPH P. DICICCO,

Petitioner,

vs.

EARL A. BONSEY, et al.,

Respondents.

REPLY BRIEF

JOSEPH P. DICICCO
Petitioner Pro Se
20 North Evarts Avenue
Elmsford, New York 10523
(914) 592-6975

Respondent Robert Tremblay's Brief in Opposition, magnifies federal court's error in intentionally ignoring this Court's counsel, that the factual allegations of the well-plead Complaint are to be presumed to be true.[1] The fact that federal court "rewrote" the Complaint, by contending that the Complaint contained a claim for appellate review, (when the Complaint was the very antithesis of review) underscored the fact that the Complaint was well-plead. Tremblay "rewrites" the Petition, and the Complaint, stating that the Petition is solely based on Local Rule 19(c), when a simple reading shows that the Petition has absolutely nothing to do with the said rule.

The Complaint clearly indicates that a key element of Tremblay's fraud, was to deny the existence of a marker in the ravine. Now, Tremblay states that there was a marker in the ravine. (p.1) This is an attempt to remove Judge Smith's complicity in the Tremblay perjury, because Judge Smith knew Tremblay was lying at the Tremblay bench trial, when he adamantly denied the existence of a marker, in the ravine. The new evidence, that was concealed by Judge Smith, and Petitioner's attorney, Defendant Collier, proves that Smith knew that Tremblay was lying about the nonexistence of the marker in the ravine. Tremblay now disavows his perjury, after his perjury has succeeded in obtaining land and money.

1. Albright V. Oliver, ___ U.S. ___, ___, 114 S.Ct.807, 810, 127 L.Ed.2d. 114, (1994); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 40 L.Ed.2d. 90 (1974)

Aside from the fact that Tremblay used his brief as a platform from which to slander the Petitioner, these "twists" underscore the tandem and symbiotic relationship between the judiciary, and a significant number of Mainers, with a resulting toxic effect, on the free flow of commerce between the states.

Will the Court allow this erosion of interstate common man commerce, or is the Court just interested in interstate commerce for big corporations, and corporate power? When this Petitioner put his life on the line, in the Korean War, he did it for the common man, not for corporate power. Was the Petitioner also hoodwinked by his country, and not just by Bonsey et al?

Respectfully submitted this 15th day of April, 1997.

Joseph P. DiCicco

JOSEPH P. DICICCO PRO SE
20 North Evarts Avenue
Elmsford, New York 10523
(914) 592-6975